

**REMARKS**

This is in response to the Office Action that was mailed on February 1, 2005. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indicated allowability of claimed subject matter herein. Claims 17-19 are amended, and claims 21-22 are cancelled, without prejudice to their subject matter, in order to expedite the prosecution of the present application. No new matter is introduced by this Amendment. Claims 17-20 and 23-25 are pending in the application.

Claims 17-19 and 23-25 were rejected under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112 as failing to define the invention properly. Office Action, pages 2-6.

Regarding item l) claim 19 is now amended to correct "R<sup>1</sup>-R<sup>1</sup>-" to "-R<sup>1</sup>-R<sup>1</sup>-".

In item r), Office Action, page 3, the Examiner raises certain question concerning the terminology "alkyl-onium salt" and similar terminology. While it is believed that those skilled in the art are conversant with such terminology, solely in order to expedite the prosecution of this application, the terminology in question is deleted from the claims.

Regarding item s), "ALK" is defined as a single bond bridge or alkylene, alkenylene, or alkynylene. Each of these is a divalent moiety. While "alkyl" is monovalent, "alkylene" is divalent. Correspondingly, "alkenylene" is an alkenyl group (that is, an unsaturated alkyl group) which is divalent. A similar analysis applies to "alkynylene". Finally, the single bond bridge is likewise divalent.

In items t) – aa) on pages 4-6 of the Office Action, the Examiner notes various errors

errors in the nomenclature of substituents (“ethylenethio”, etc.) The incorrect nomenclature has been corrected (to “ethenylenethio”, etc.)

On page 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that the substituent “arylalkylthio” appears twice in claim 17. That double inclusion is corrected by this Amendment.

At the bottom of page 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that certain nomenclature is indefinite. That nomenclature is corrected by this Amendment.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims in their current form satisfy the requirements of the statute.

Claims 21 and 22 were rejected under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112 as failing to comply with the written description requirement. This ground of rejection is rendered moot by the cancellation of those claims.

On page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner includes a paragraph with respect to priority. It is noted that the present specification was amended to contain a reference to the PCT application of which the present application is a continuation, in the application transmittal papers that were filed on August 23, 2001. In the event that this amendment was not entered, the Examiner is authorized to make an appropriate amendment by Examiner’s Amendment.

If the Examiner has any questions concerning this application, she is requested to contact Richard Gallagher, Reg. No. 28,781, at (703) 205-8008.


Serial No.: 09/934,531

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 CFR 1.16 or under 37 CFR 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By

  
Gerald M. Murphy, Jr.  
Reg. No. 28,977

P. O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000

GMM/RG *RG*